DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 410 CS 508 589

AUTHOR Sass, James S.
TITLE The Value of Organizational Research for the Study of Social Movement Rhetoric: Conceptual and Methodological Issues.
PUB DATE Feb 94
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western States Communication Association (San Jose, CA, February 23-27, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; Feminism; Higher Education; *Organizational Communication; Research Methodology; *Rhetoric; Social Structure
IDENTIFIERS *Organizational Culture; Research Suggestions; Rhetorical Strategies; *Social Movements

ABSTRACT

Traditional scholarship on social movements has emphasized external rhetoric and the role of the leader, rather than the internal dynamics of social movement organizations. This paper is an argument for the integration of experiences and meanings related to membership. Belle Edson's feminist critique of social movement studies provides a framework for examining the assumptions of the dominant, conflict-oriented approach. Organizational culture research provides a methodological foundation for investigating these issues. This integrated approach would lead to a stronger understanding of the functions and meanings of social movement rhetoric. Such research would help in continuing the expansion of the scope of organizational research beyond profit-making corporations and would foster intradisciplinary dialog among rhetorical and organizational scholars. Contains 63 notes. (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 371 410

THE VALUE OF ORGANIZATIONAL RESEARCH FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL MOVEMENT RHETORIC: CONCEPTUAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

James S. Sass
Department of Communication
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-1205
602-965-5095

Presented as part of
"Exploring the Rhetoric of Collectivities: A Student Sampler"
Western States Communication Association
San Jose, California
February, 1994

CS508589

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Sass

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Traditional scholarship on social movements has emphasized external rhetoric and the role of the leader, rather than the internal dynamics of social movement organizations. This paper is an argument for the integration of experiences and meanings related to membership. Edson's feminist critique of social movement studies provides a framework for examining the assumptions of the dominant, conflict-oriented approach. Organizational culture research provides a methodological foundation for investigating these issues. This integrated approach would lead to a stronger understanding of the functions and meanings of social movement rhetoric.

THE VALUE OF ORGANIZATIONAL RESEARCH FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL MOVEMENT RHETORIC

Rhetorical scholarship on social movements has been characterized by ontological controversy. Much of the discussion has been related to the collective aspects of social movements, specifically social movement organizations. The assumption that social movement organizations are in some way unique from other collectivities has been the focus of continued debate.[1] Also, many have drawn a sharp distinction between the study of movement rhetoric and the study of internal/interpersonal dynamics of these collectivities.[2] Still, the complementarity between rhetorical and social study of movements is considered to hold great promise.[3]

While the collective nature of social movements has been the source of much speculation, this facet has been met with inadequate research. Many scholars have stated the need for more research on internal dynamics.[4] Possible topics for investigation have been raised throughout recent rhetorical scholarship on social movements. A selective list of these topics includes interpersonal issues (solidarity, commitment, group identification, membership gratifications, social support), issues of organizational structure, leaders' roles and responsibilities, and the creation of consensual reality.[5]

Within studies of organizational communication, many of these issues have been addressed by scholars adhering to an interpretive-cultural approach.[6] This growing endeavor has emphasized the symbolic nature of social collectivities. Research programs within this approach have been sensitive to the

rhetorical aspects of organizing.[7] Interpretive research provides a uniquely appropriate means for investigating many of the issues that rhetorical scholars have raised regarding the collective nature of social movements.

This essay is an argument for the value of triangulating interpretive organizational research with social movement criticism. The functionalist approach of Simons will be critiqued and extended through the application of Edson's "female-systems" critique of prominent literature on social movements and the interpretive approach to organizational communication. Implications for future research will be drawn from this analysis.

Perspectives on Social Movements

The half-century of multi-disciplinary research on social movements has witnessed the use of a number of models. Prominent models have included historical study, an emphasis on social continuity/innovation, and a resource mobilization focus.[8] The predominant model has been termed "the establishment-conflict theory."[9] Central to this model is the assumption that social movements are in a direct and explicit state of confrontation with the larger society. This model has been represented by two lines of scholarship: Griffin's dramatistic approach and Simons' functionalist approach.

Dramatistic Approach

Griffin's approach has been directed toward the study of the rhetoric of historical movements.[10] The distinctive characteristics of such rhetoric are open confrontation with the

prevailing social order and a movement's progression through distinct, linear stages. Each stage is marked by the response of the political or social establishment. Through Griffin's eventual adoption of selected Burkeian terms, this approach has become identified with dramatism.[11] Based upon Griffin's assumptions and Burke's concept of "form," Cathcart identifies confrontation as the *defining* form of movement rhetoric.[12]

The dramatistic approach has made a great contribution to the field. It is often considered *the* primary approach to movement criticism. The practicality and value of this approach are found in the longitudinal perspective and clear categories.[13] Still, proponents of competing approaches have condemned it as narrow, rigid, and undersupported.[14]

Functionalist Approach

Herbert Simons offers a fundamentally sociological approach to the rhetoric of social movements.[15] The central issue is the leader's role as intermediary between "an uninstitutionalized collectivity" seeking social change and the society in which the change is sought.[16] The focus for rhetorical criticism is the means by which the group attempts to exert influence upon society.

The theoretical foundation is a group of assumptions about the nature of social organization. Simons argues that leaders of social movements must fulfill the same requirements as do corporate executives. Based upon the structural-functionalism of Parsons and Merton, three "functional imperatives of formal organizations" are offered.

(1) "They must attract, maintain, and mold workers (i.e., followers) into an efficiently organized unit."

(2) "They must secure adoption of their product by the larger structure (i.e., the external system, the established order."

(3) "They must react to resistance generated by the larger structure."[17]

While movement leaders and corporate executives have similar functional requirements, they are faced with dissimilar constraints. Movement leaders "can expect minimal internal control and maximal external resistance." [18]

The leader's accomplishment of these requirements, through external rhetoric, is the substance of this form of social movement criticism. While noting the importance of internal concerns, Simons clearly places emphasis upon external--rather than internal--communication.[19] The tension between the importance of internal concerns and the exclusion of internal communication indicates a fundamental ambiguity in Simons' approach.

This ambiguity is displayed in the "bottom up" metaphor. Social movement organizations are cast as disenfranchised groups "mobilizing for action from the bottom up."[20] The pressure for social change comes "up" from the "bottom" of society. Thus, a traditionally intra-organizational term ("bottom up") has been applied to the study of the functions of the organization within the larger society. Ironically, the leader-centered focus of this approach casts the social movement organization itself as a "top down" collectivity.

The root of this ambiguity is the application of the structural-functionalist framework to the study of organizations. Structural-functionalist analysis is focused upon "large-scale social structures and institutions."[21] Thus, Simons' examination of the functions of social movement organizations within the larger society is consistent with the sociological framework. Conversely, structural-functionalism is not an appropriate framework for studying the intra-organizational dynamics that are foundational to Simons' approach.

The emphasis on leaders' external rhetoric limits the applicability of the functionalist approach. As a tool for rhetorical criticism, it has been criticized for this narrow focus.[22] This narrowness also is evident when the approach is examined from the perspective of organizational communication. Recent examinations indicate that organizational research has moved far beyond the leader-as-organization synecdoche.[23] Further, Weick has argued that leadership research should focus upon everyday, internal communication of leaders.[24]

Summary

Among the numerous approaches to the study of social movement rhetoric, a confrontational perspective maintains prominence. The two primary approaches of this perspective--dramatistic and functionalist--feature the *study* of social movements within society, and *assumptions* about the collective nature of movements themselves. The functionalist approach--with its emphasis on the requirements, problems, and strategies inherent to social movement leadership--exhibits potential for

answering questions about the internal dynamics of social movement organizations. Still, limitations in terms of its macro-sociological framework, ambiguity, and narrowness prevent this for becoming a satisfactory approach for capturing both external and internal factors. Such an extension requires a broader perspective on social movements.

A Pluralistic Perspective on Social Action

The many limitations of the establishment-conflict theory are rooted in the foundational assumptions of this perspective. Edson's critique of this perspective exposes these assumptions and, consequently, provides a foundation for a pluralistic approach to social movements.[25] Edson's pluralistic approach shares certain key issues (e.g., concern for multiple meanings and the experiences of members) with scholarship representing the interpretive-cultural approach to organizations, which provides a methodological framework for the study of internal dynamics of social movement organizations.

"Female-Systems" Critique

Writing from "a female-systems perspective," Belle Edson provides a sharp critique of the perspective advocated by Griffin, Cathcart, and Simons. The assumptions of the confrontational perspective are rooted in "the dominant male-oriented culture."[26] Through identifying these assumptions and their pluralistic counterparts,[27] Edson develops a conceptual foundation for the study of social movements as social collectivities.

Assumptions of the traditional approach are clustered into four categories. (1) The central character in any movement is a

single, identifiable leader. (2) Members share a common motivation, and are ordered/organized in a hierarchy. (3) A movement progresses in distinct, linear stages. (4) An ideology, different from that of the larger society, is central to each social movement.[28]

The discussion and critique of these assumptions leads to suggestions for an alternative approach. A number of research questions are proposed.[29] These questions perform two functions. First, subsequent research could lead to a female-systems understanding of social movements. Second, the assumptions of the traditional approach are often treated as questions for research. Thus, the development of this alternative approach would provide a research-based critique of the traditional perspective.

While Edson advocates a *conceptually* distinct approach to social movements, this approach also raises methodological issues. Many of the proposed questions would best be answered through research *within* the organization (e.g., "Who participates in decision making? Are issues other than ideology more important as motivating elements--such as personal relationships?).[30] A pluralistic approach must seek the multiple, and often dissonant, voices within social movements.[31] The meanings constructed by members are to be studied, not assumed. A similar view has been advanced by scholars advocating an interpretive-cultural approach to organizational communication.

Organizations as Communication Cultures

Since the early 1980s scholars have developed an alternative approach to organizational communication. Contrary to the positivist and management-oriented biases of traditional approaches, this approach has been based upon the assumptions of interpretivism.[32] Concepts central to interpretive research include symbolic construction of social reality, intersubjective meaning, and a pluralistic view of collective activity.[33]

The guiding metaphor of the interpretive approach is organizational culture.[34] Organizations are understood "as systems of shared symbols and meanings."[35] Social actions are inextricably linked to the actors' meanings for these actions. The role of the researcher is to experience and re-construct the ways in which the actors "make sense" of collective life.[36]

The interpretive approach is informed by multiple traditions of research.[37] Among the many potential means for gathering data,[38] participant-observation is quite common.[39] Also, there are multiple models for the interpretation of such data. A model especially appropriate for triangulation with rhetorical criticism is the Organizational Communication Culture Method (OCCM) developed by Bantz.[40]

The OCCM leads the researcher through collection, analysis, and interpretation of data in order to infer organizational expectations and meanings.[41] The analysis section of the OCCM concerns the identification and interpretation of message characteristics and symbolic forms. The applicability of the OCCM to the study of social movement rhetoric is evidenced in the chapter on symbolic forms.[42] These dramaturgical forms

(metaphors, stories, and fantasy themes) provide a clear connection between organizational and rhetorical analysis. The analysis of these messages and forms provides the foundation for establishing patterns of meanings and expectations (including roles, motives, and style). Conducted properly, this process leads to a communicative understanding of organizational life.[43]

Summary

The pluralistic critique of traditional social movement theory offered by Edson provides three utilities. First, it exposes the privileged, white male bias that is foundational to the establishment-conflict theory. Second, a pluralistic approach to social movement studies is suggested. Finally, Edson provides a conceptual framework for the integration of intra-organizational research on social movements. The interpretive approach to organizational communication complements and supplements Edson's approach through providing a means for studying social movement organizations as though they were cultures.

Implications

Research within this frame would involve both internal and external communication.[44] Edson emphasizes examining the relationship between formal statements and organizational experience.[45] Many of her potential research questions touch upon issues raised by Simons, Stewart, and others. The four themes Edson identified in previous social movement theory will provide an organizing scheme for questions regarding these issues.

Assumptions about the centrality of leadership lead to questions about decision making.[46] Edson poses questions about participation in decision making, and the decision making process itself. Related questions raised by Simons include the roles and functions of leaders, and the possibility of conflict between the goals of the leaders and the interpersonal needs of the members.[47]

Assumptions about group membership foster inquiry into the structure of social movement organizations.[48] Questions of power and hierarchy within the groups are raised by Edson. Also at issue is the relationship between the members and the larger society. Related issues in the functionalist program include the management of mixed constituencies, and the development of "we-they" relationships among the membership and between the membership and society.[49] Zarefsky's contention that the means of internal control available to social movement leaders are no different than those available to executives also could be investigated.[50]

Assumptions about the progression of movements lead to questions about movement development and the experience of time.[51] Edson's questions involve patterns of development, the possibility of enduring qualities of a movement, recurrent patterns, longitudinal development of salient issues, and the conceptualization of time. A related issue is Stewart's question about the effects of external success upon the internal dynamics of the group.[52] Also, the relationship between external confrontation (if discovered) and internal solidarity may be examined.[53]

Assumptions about ideology provide questions regarding themes in discourse and motivations of members.[54] Edson raises a number of issues: "themes that combine to create [an] ideology," non-public themes in the ideology, members' motivation for joining and remaining in the movement, dissonant voices within the movement, and aspects of the ideology that are common in the larger society. Many of these issues relate to Lucas' promotion of studying the "consciousness" of the members.[55] Functionalist scholars have raised many similar issues: social support, maintaining commitment, member needs and gratifications, group identity, and means of mobilization.[56]

The above paragraphs list issues that may be examined through interpretive research within social movement organizations. Through comparing the characteristics of these communication cultures with their formal statements researchers will be able to make stronger claims about the functions and meanings of social movement rhetoric. An optimal method for establishing these meanings and functions would be a full-scale OCCM analysis. A minimal step should be member checks.

Confirmation and/or correction of the researcher's interpretations, by members of the group, is a vital issue for interpretive research.[57] Since practitioners of the functionalist approach routinely make claims about the ways in which rhetoric means and functions for movement members, they have a responsibility to assess the fidelity of their interpretations. While interviews of members would be an obvious option for contemporary movements, there are also a variety of

data sources for movements of the past. These include letters and journals of the members, internal documents, and interviews with descendants of the members.[58] Examination of these sources could lead to an improved understanding of the members' sense of their own experience.

Between simple member checks and OCCM analysis are issue-oriented studies. Single research questions could be answered through organizational research. A limited OCCM analysis would reveal relationships between specific themes/forms and organizational life. Presumably, these would be a primary means for advancing an integrated approach to social movements. Studies exhibiting some of these characteristics with this approach are already in publication.

The following are a few examples of intra-organizational research of social movements. While none completely meet the objectives advanced in this essay, each is illustrative of potential research. Kroll's study of fantasy themes in the newsletters of women's movement organizations revealed transformation across time.[59] Walsh examined internal documents and eyewitness accounts to analyze dyadic communication in the Maoist insurgency.[60] Arthurs analyzed descriptions of small group activities as a means of explaining *how* the ego-function works within "conscientization" groups of the Liberation Theology Movement.[61] Kaminer's study of the self-help/recovery movement included data gathered through attendance of support groups and large-scale conferences, reading popular books written by leaders, and viewing the statements of both leaders and members on television talk shows.[62]

The primary benefit of this expanded approach to the study of social movement rhetoric is the potential to provide research-based answers to many questions that have been raised and debated by movement scholars. These include the relationship between external rhetoric and such concerns as organizational dynamics and members' experiences. Such research could also foster answers to questions regarding the unique nature of social movement organizations. Within organizational communication, this approach would facilitate the study of the processes of social collectivities and the experiences of movement members. Such research would help in continuing the expansion of the scope of organizational research beyond profit-making corporations.[63] Such research should also foster intradisciplinary dialogue among rhetorical and organizational scholars.

Notes

[1] Compare Herbert W. Simons, "Requirements, Problems and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," Quarterly Journal of Speech 56 (1970): 1-11; Herbert W. Simons, Elizabeth W. Mechling, and Howard Schreier, "The Functions of Human Communication in Mobilizing for Action from the Bottom Up: The Rhetoric of Social Movements," Handbook of Rhetorical and Communication Theory, eds. Carroll C. Arnold and John Waite Bowers (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1984) 792-867; Charles J. Stewart, "A Functional Approach to the Rhetoric of Social Movements," Central States Speech Journal 31 (1980): 301; with Dan F. Hahn and Ruth M. Gonchar, "Social Movement Theory: A Dead End," Communication Quarterly 28 (1980): 60-64; Michael Calvin McGee, "Social Movements: Phenomenon or Meaning," Central States Speech Journal 31 (1980): 240; and David Zarefsky, "A Skeptical View of Movement Studies," Central States Speech Journal 31 (1980): 249-251.

[2] Robert S. Cathcart, "New Approaches to the Study of Movements: Defining Movements Rhetorically," Western Speech 36 (1972): 86. Stephen E. Lucas, "Coming to Terms with Movement Studies," Central States Speech Journal 31 (1980): 261. Simons, "Requirements" 2. Herbert W. Simons, "On Terms, Definitions and Theoretical Distinctiveness: Comments on Papers by McGee and Zarefsky," Central States Speech Journal 31 (1980): 307. Simons relegates "spontaneous acts... by non-leaders" to the level of "primitive features of social movements" ("Requirements" 2).

[3] Simons, "On Terms" 315. Herbert W. Simons, "Genres, Rules, and Collective Rhetorics: Applying the Requirements-Problems-Solutions Approach. Communication Quarterly 30 (1982): 187. Lucas 262.

[4] Lucas 262. Simons, Mechling, and Schreier 842-845. Charles J. Stewart, "The Internal Rhetoric of the Knights of Labor," Communication Studies, 42 (1991): 67-82.

[5] Lucas 261-62. Simons, "Requirements." Simons, "On Terms" 313. Simons, "Genres" 182. Simons, Mechling, and Schreier, 842-45. Stewart, "Functional Approach" 299-305.

[6] Michael E. Pacanowsky and Nick O'Donnell-Trujillo, "Communication and Organizational Cultures," Western Journal of Speech Communication 46 (1982): 115-130. Linda L. Putnam, "The Interpretive Approach: An Alternative to Functionalism," Communication and Organizations: An Interpretive Approach, eds. Linda L. Putnam and Michael E. Pacanowsky (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1983) 31-54.

[7] Linda L. Putnam and George Cheney, "Organizational Communication: Historical Developments and Future Directions," Communication in the 20th Century, ed. Thomas W. Benson (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1985) 145-147. Charles R. Bantz, Understanding Organizations: Interpreting Organizational

Communication Cultures (Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1993).

[8] Simons, Mechling, and Schreier. Pamela Struble Joraanstad, "Innovational Theory Examined through an Analysis of the Term Limitation Movement," diss., Arizona State University, 1992, 6-14.

[9] Ralph R. Smith and Russel R. Windes, "The Innovational Movement: A Rhetorical Theory," Quarterly Journal of Speech 61 (1975): 140-142.

[10] Leland M. Griffin, "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," Quarterly Journal of Speech, (1952): 184-88. Leland M. Griffin, "A Dramatistic Theory of the Rhetoric of Movements," Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, ed. William H. Rueckert (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1969) 456-78.

[11] Griffin, "Dramatistic Theory."

[12] Cathcart, "New Approaches." Robert S. Cathcart, "Movements: Confrontation as Rhetorical Form," Southern Speech Communication Journal, 43 (1978): 223-247.

[13] Simons, Mechling, and Schreier, 801, 804-07, 808.

[14] Smith and Windes, 140-142, Simons, Mechling, and Schreier, 805.

[15] Major statements are Simons, "Requirements." Simons, Mechling, and Schreier. This approach also has been advanced by Stewart, "Functional Approach" and "Internal Rhetoric."

[16] Simons, "Requirements," 3. Also, Simons, Mechling, and Schreier, 794.

[17] Simons, "Requirements" 3-4. Simons, Mechling, and Schreier, 807.

[18] Simons, "Requirements" 3.

[19] While noting that Stewart and he share a "theoretical framework," Simons criticizes Stewart for not emphasizing the external rhetoric of the Knights of Labor. Herbert W. Simons, "On the Rhetoric of Social Movements, Historical Movements, and 'Top-Down' Movements: A Commentary," Communication Studies 42 (1991): 95-96.

[20] Simons, Mechling, and Schreier. Also, Simons, "On the Rhetoric" 100-01.

[21] George Ritzer, Contemporary Sociological Theory 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1992) 526, 133.

[22] Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "The Rhetoric of Women's Liberation: An Oxymoron," Quarterly Journal of Speech 59 (1973):

86.

[23] Putnam and Cheney. Stacia Wert-Gray, Candy Center, Dale E. Brashers, and Renee Meyers, "Research Topics and Methodological Orientation in Organizational Communication: A Decade in Review," Communication Studies 42 (1991): 141-154.

[24] Karl E. Weick, "Organizational Communication: Toward a Research Agenda," Communication and Organizations: An Interpretive Approach, eds. Linda L. Putnam & Michael E. Pacanowsky (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1983) 25.

[25] Belle A. Edson, "Bias in Social Movement Theory: A View from a Female Systems Perspective," Women's Studies in Communication 8 (1985): 34-45.

[26] Edson 34.

[27] While Edson's argument is rooted in a specific feminist perspective, it engages aspects of a broader range of human experience. Edson notes that her perspective is linked to muted-group theory (36). Also, though not addressed in Edson's essay, many of the characteristics of female-systems are shared by particular non-westernized cultures. See John C. Condon and Fathi Yousef, Introduction to Intercultural Communication (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1975) 63-121; and Carley H. Dodd, Dynamics of Intercultural Communication (Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown, 1982). Further, Edson's perspective may be deemed pluralistic in that group membership is not monolithic. Edson acknowledges the many voices and motivations found within the membership of a movement.

[28] Edson 38-40.

[29] Edson 41-43.

[30] Edson 41, 43.

[31] In management studies, the need to study multiple viewpoints within the organization is articulated by Joanne Martin and Debra Meyerson, "Organizational Cultures and the Denial, Channeling and Acknowledgment of Ambiguity," Managing Ambiguity and Change, eds. Louis R. Pondy, Richard J. Boland, Jr., and Howard Thomas (New York: Wiley, 1988) 93-125.

[32] Putnam 32-39.

[33] Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo. Putnam. Charles R. Bantz, "Naturalistic Research Traditions," Communication and Organizations: An Interpretive Approach, eds. Linda L. Putnam and Michael E. Pacanowsky (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1983) 55-71.

[34] Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo. Barbara Czarniawska-Joerges, Exploring Complex Organizations: A Cultural Approach (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992).

[35] Linda Smircich and Marta B. Calas, "Organizational Culture: A Critical Assessment," Handbook of Organizational Communication: An Interdisciplinary Perspective, eds. Frederic M. Jablin, Linda L. Putnam, Karlene H. Roberts, and Lyman W. Porter (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1987) 241.

[36] Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo 122-24. Smircich and Calas 241.

[37] Bantz, "Naturalistic Research" 55-58, 64-69. Putnam 40-47.

[38] Bantz, "Naturalistic Research" 64-69.

[39] Smircich and Calas 241.

[40] Bantz, Understanding Organizations.

[41] Bantz, Understanding Organizations 2.

[42] Bantz, Understanding Organizations 113-134.

[43] Bantz, Understanding Organizations 15.

[44] Such a focus is not unique to this essay. Stewart has extended Simons' approach by focusing on internal rhetoric and encouraging study of the relationship between internal and external rhetoric ("Internal Rhetoric" 68, 80). Still, this extension is limited to formal statements by leaders, not day-to-day activities of members.

[45] Edson 41-43.

[46] Edson 41.

[47] Simons, "Genres" 182. Simons, "Requirements" 5-6. Simons, Mechling, and Schreier, 808.

[48] Edson 41-42.

[49] Simons, Mechling, and Schreier, 815. Stewart, "Functional Approach" 303.

[50] Zarefsky 251.

[51] Edson 42.

[52] Stewart, "Functional Approach" 305.

[53] Simons, "On Terms" 313.

[54] Edson 43.

[55] Lucas, "Coming to Terms" 25-257.

[56] Stewart, "Functional Approach" 299-305. Simons, "Requirements" 3, 6. Simons, Mechling, and Schreier, 813.

[57] Yvonna S. Lincoln and Egon G. Guba, Naturalistic Inquiry (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1985) 236, 314-16.

[58] Additional sources of data are discussed by Bantz, "Naturalistic Research" 64-69.

[59] Becky Swanson Kroll, "From Small Group to Public View: Mainstreaming the Women's Movement," Communication Quarterly 31 (1983): 139-147. One distinction between this study and leader-centered studies is that the newsletters "had open editorial policies and encouraged all interested women to submit materials in any form" (147).

[60] J.F. Walsh, Jr., "An Approach to Dyadic Communication in Historical Social Movements: Dyadic Communication in Maoist Insurgent Mobilization," Communication Monographs, 53 (1986): 1-15.

[61] Jeffrey D. Arthurs, "The Ego-Function of Conscientization as Employed by Small Groups of Liberation Theology," Journal of Communication and Religion 15(1) (1992): 1-14.

[62] Wendy Kaminer, I'm Dysfunctional, You're Dysfunctional: The Recovery Movement and Other Self-Help Fashions (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1992). While Kaminer focuses on social analysis rather than rhetorical criticism, her book offers insight into the rhetoric of the self-help movement.

[63] Leonard C. Hawes, "Social Collectivities as Communication," Foundations of Organizational Communication: A Reader, eds. Steven R. Corman, Stephen P. Banks, Charles R. Bantz, and Michael E. Mayer (New York: Longman, 1990) 42-43; Gary L. Kreps, Organizational Communication: Theory and Practice 2nd ed. (New York: Longman, 1990) 4-8.